

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00532 01 OF 02 312000Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00
SAJ-01 OIC-02 EB-08 /070 W
-----312018Z 127158 /43

R 311810Z JAN 77
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1444
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO DA WASHDC
CSAF
CNO WASHDC

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0532

SECDEF FOR ODTACCS, ODDR&E(IP), OASD(ISA)(I&L); DA FOR DAMA-PPI;
CSAF FOR RDI; CNO FOR OP-098F

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: NATO, ETEL, MARR
SUBJECT: NADREPS MEETING, JANUARY 24, 1977, DISCUSSION OF
TRI-SERVICE GROUP ON COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS (TSG)

REF: (A) USNATO 0465 DTG 271642Z JAN 77 (NOTAL)
(B) USNATO 0475 DTG 280919Z JAN 77 (NOTAL)
(C) USNATO 0143 DTG 121725Z JAN 77

SUMMARY: THIS MESSAGE SUMMARIZES THE NADREP DISCUSSION ON THE
TRI-SERVICE GROUP ON COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS (TSG).
ASYG(DS) LABERGE REVIEWED PAST PORGRESS ON THE FORMATION OF A
TRI-SERVICE GROUP ON COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS AND POLLED
THE NADREPS TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT OF NATIONAL AGREEMENT WITH
THE DRAFT PORPOSED TOR. ELEVEN NATIONS AGREED. THE CANADIAN
NADREP REPORTED HE HAD RECEIVED NO INSTRUCTIONS. THE UK NADREP,
UNDER INSTRUCTIONS, TABLED A STATEMENT PROVIDED BELOW
WHICH EXPLAINS THE DIFFICULTIES THAT THE UK HAS WITH THE
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00532 01 OF 02 312000Z

TOR. AFTER CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION OF THE UK POSITION,
THE CHAIRMAN ATTEMPTED TO OBTAIN A COMPROMISE TOR. UNABLE
TO OBTAIN A COMPROMISE, THE CHAIRMAN REQUESTED THAT THE
NADREPS HAVE THEIR NATIONS REVIEW THE UK POSITION AND
REPORT BACK AT THE NEXT NADREP MEETING. RECOMMEND WE
MAINTAIN OUR PREVIOUS POSITION BASED ON PAST GUIDANCE.
REQUEST WASHINGTON CONCURRENCE. END SUMMARY.

1. BY REF (A) WE REPORTED ON THE DRAFT PROPOSED AGENDA
FOR THE NEXT CNAD MEETING. BY REF (B) WE REPORTED ON

OTHER ITEMS DISCUSSED AT SUBJECT MEETING.

2. THE CHAIRMAN, ASYG(DS) LABERGE, REVIEWED THE STATUS OF WORK ON THE TSG AS OF THE LAST NADREP MEETING AND INFORMED THE NADREPS OF THE US AND INTERNATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS ON THE PREVIOUS UK POSITION (PARA 2, REF C) ON RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE TSG TO ADDRESS OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS. HE REMINDED THE GROUP OF THE CNAD DIRECTION TO PREPARE THE TOR, EXAMINE THE FUNCTIONS OF AC/225 (PANEL VIII) AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE TSG, AND PREPARE INITIAL ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE TSG.

3. STRESSING THAT HE DESIRED TO HAVE THE TSG COMMENCE ITS MEETINGS PRIOR TO THE NEXT CNAD MEETING, LABERGE POLLED THE NADREPS TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT OF AGREEMENT ON THE DRAFT TOR. ALL NATIONS AGREED TO THE TOR AS DESCRIBED IN AC/259-N/219, EXCEPT FOR CANADA AND THE UK. THE CANADIAN NADREP INFORMED THE CHAIRMAN HE HAD RECEIVED NO INSTRUCTIONS. THE UK POSITION IS REPORTED IN PARA 5 BELOW.

4. IN AGREEING TO THE TOR, SEVERAL NADREPS MADE COMMENTS. FRANCE FAVORS A CAREFUL APPROACH, BELIEVING THAT THE CNAD SHOULD LIMIT THE TSG'S INITIAL WORK AND THAT THE TOR SHOULD PARALLEL THE TOR OF OTHER ARMAMENTS GROUPS. GERMANY AGREES WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 00532 01 OF 02 312000Z

INTERNATIONAL STAFF AND CANNOT AGREE WITH THE UK POSITION. THE NETHERLANDS AND NORWAY FAVOR TRANSFER OF AC/225 (PANEL VIII) TO THE TSG.

5. THE UK NADREP READ A STATEMENT (QUOTED BELOW) REFLECTING THE INSTRUCTIONS OF HIS AUTHORITIES.
QUOTE.

1. THE UK POSITION AT THE LAST MEETING IS RECORDED IN THE ANNEX TO AC/259-N/220. SINCE WE NOTE THAT OTHER NATIONS DO NOT APPEAR TO SHARE OUR CONCERN TO BRING THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE TRI-SERVICE GROUP MORE IN TO LINE WITH THE OTHER MAIN ARMAMENT GROUPS, WE ARE PREPARED TO MOVE A CONSIDERABLE WAY TO MEET THE VIEWS OF OTHERS. HOWEVER, BEFORE ADDRESSING THE TEXT WHICH IS UNDER DISCUSSION, I WOULD LIKE TO REMIND YOU THAT THE UK HAS ALWAYS BEEN SCEPTICAL ABOUT THE NEED FOR AND THE VALUE OF A TRI-SERVICE GROUP ON COMMUNICATIONS. NEVERTHELESS, AS THE MAJORITY OF OTHER NATIONS WERE IN FAVOR OF IT, SIR CLIFFORD CORNFORD AGREED AT THE LAST CNAD THAT THE UK ALSO WOULD AGREE TO ITS CREATION SUBJECT TO CERTAIN CONDITIONS WHICH, FOR CONVENIENCE, I NOW REPEAT:

(A) A LIST OF THE ISSUES THAT THE TRI-SERVICE GROUP SHOULD DISCUSS SHOULD BE PREPARED BY THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF AND AGREED BY THE NADREPS;

(B) NO SINGLE-SERVICE FORUM ON COMMUNICATIONS OR ELECTRONICS SHOULD BE DIVERTED FROM ITS TASKS OR RESPONSIBILITIES WHERE THESE ARE CLEARLY SINGLE-SERVICE ISSUES;

(C) THERE SHOULD BE NO DUPLICATION OF EFFORT AND OTHER BODIES SHOULD STOP WORK ON ANY MATTER WHICH IT IS AGREED SHOULD BE DEALT WITH BY THE TRI-SERVICE GROUP;
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 00532 01 OF 02 312000Z

(D) ANY SUBORDINATE BODY SET UP BY THE TRI-SERVICE GROUP SHOULD HAVE A LIMITED LIFE.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 00532 02 OF 02 312015Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00
SAJ-01 OIC-02 EB-08 /070 W
-----312017Z 127334 /43

R 311810Z JAN 77
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1445
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO DA
CSAF
CNO WASHDC

C O N F I D E N T I A L FINAL SECTION OF 2 USNATO 0532

2. THESE GUIDELINES WERE ACCEPTED AT THE CNAD AND ARE RECORDED IN THE DECISION SHEET. THE UK ALSO HAD IN MIND THE GENERAL CONCERN EXPRESSED VERY OFTEN IN CNAD CIRCLES ABOUT THE NEED TO ENSURE THAT OUR WORKING METHODS ARE SIMPLE AND, INDEED, AT THE APRIL CNAD, IT WAS SPECIFICALLY STATED THAT:

"...THE NADREPS SHOULD PREPARE A PLAN FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TRI-SERVICE GROUP IN SUCH A WAY AS TO REDUCE AND SIMPLIFY THE WORK IN THE FIELD OF COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT AND TO ENSURE THAT CONTROL AND SUPERVISION RESTS WITH THE CNAD."

3. DR. LABERGE HAS CIRCULATED A PAPER WHICH SUGGESTS SOME WORK WHICH MIGHT BE ADDRESSED BY THE TSG AT AN EARLY STAGE, AND I WILL BE HAPPY TO GIVE OUR VIEWS ON THESE

INDIVIDUALLY LATER IN THE MEETING. BUT IT SEEMS IMPORTANT FIRST TO GET THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE GROUP CORRECT.

4. PAPER AC/259-N/219 OF 21ST DECEMBER, 1976,
SUMMARIZED DISCUSSIONS OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE.
CERTAIN RESERVATIONS ARE RECORDED AGAINST PARAGRAPH 2
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00532 02 OF 02 312015Z

AS BEING MADE BY THE UK THOUGH, IF MY MEMORY IS CORRECT, OTHER COUNTRIES ALSO SHARED OUR DOUBTS. FOR EXAMPLE, IF WAS I THINK THE UNITED STATES WHO FIRST SUGGESTED THAT THE WORD "MULTI-SERVICE" SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE TERMS OF REFERENCE; AND IT REMAINS OUR VIEW THAT THIS WORD SHOULD BE INSERTED.

5. AS REGARDS OTHER AMEMDMENTS TO PARAGRAPH 2, THE UK WOULD NOT WISH TO ARGUE THAT, AFTER THE PRESENT ROUND OF DISCUSSIONS, THE NADREPS SHOULD GIVE CONTINUING DIRECTION ON ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED BY THE TSG AND WE, FOR OUR PART, DO NOT WISH TO PRESS AMENDMENT (C).

6. THIS LEAVES AMENDMENT (B) WHICH IS IN LINE WITH CNAD'S POLICY THAT THE TRI-SERVICE GROUP SHOULD NOT DEAL WITH SINGLE-SERVICE MATTERS. WE BELIEVE THERE IS AN IMPORTANT PRACTICAL POINT AT STAKE HERE. WE DO NOT AGREE WITH THE COMMENT IN AC/259-N/219 THAT "FEW IF ANY COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS MATTERS CAN BE CLEARLY IDENTIFIED AS SINGLE-SERVICE." THIS IS PALPABLY UNTURE. NOR CAN WE SUPPORT THE COMMENT THAT "THE TSG SHOULD BE EMPOWERED TO DEAL WITH ALL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT MATTERS." HAD THESE VIEWS BEEN EXPRESSED AT CNAD, WE DOUBT IF ANYONE WOULD HAVE ENDORSED THEM.

7. HOWEVER, AS THESE SENTIFMENTS DO NOT APPEAR IN THE TERMS OF REFERENCE, I WILL NOT DWELL ON THEM FURTHER. WE WOULD PREFER TO SEE AMENDMENT (B) ACCEPTED BUT IF IT HELPS TO SECURE GENERAL AGREEMENT TO TERMS OF REFERENCE, WE WOULD BE PREPARED TO WITHDRAW IT, PROVIDED THAT SATER THE PRESENT SECOND SENTENCE OF PARAGRAPH 2 THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE WERE ADDED: "IT WILL NOT PRECESS MATTERS WHICH CAN MORE EFFECTIVELY BE HANDLED IN EXISTING BODIES, E.G., THE MAIN ARMAMENT GROUPS."

8. AS REGARDS PARAGRAPH 3(A) AND PARAGRAPH 9 OF THE
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 00532 02 OF 02 312015Z

TERMS OF REFERENCE, THE UK CONSIDERS IT VERY IMPORTANT THAT THE REFINEMENT OF MILITARY OBJECTIVES AND NEEDS INTO OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE CONDUCTED WITHIN THE CNAD FRAMEWORK. WE COULD NOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSAL

THAT THE TSG SHOULD BE REGARDED SOLELY AS A PROCUREMENT BODY. WE THEREFORE REGARD THE WORDING OF PARAGRAPH 9(A) AS A GENERAL EXPRESSION AND NOT IN ANY WAY IMPLYING THAT THE NATO MILITARY AUTHORITIES HAVE EXTENDED THEIR ROLE IN THE OR FIELD BEYOND WHAT IS CURRENTLY EXPECTED OF THEM. IT IS OVER 10 YEARS NOW SINCE THE NBMR SYSTEM WAS DISCONTINUED AND THE UK WOULD BE OPPOSED TO MOVES WHICH MIGHT LEAD TO ITS REINSTATEMENT. IN THE INTERESTS OF CLARITY WE PROPOSED THAT, AS ALREADY USED IN PARAGRAPH 9(C), THE WORDS "OPERATIONAL NEEDS" SHOULD BE USED ALSO IN PARAGRAPH 9(A) INSTEAD OF THE WORDS "OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS." SINCE THE LATTER IS VERY MUCH A TERM OF ART. WE ALSO PROPOSE THAT THE WORDS "WHEN NECESSARY" IN PARAGRAPH 3(KK(A) AND "WHEN APPROPRIATE " IN 9(A) BE DELETED. WE EXPECT THE UK REPRESENTATION ON THE TSG WILL HAVE A STRONG OR ELEMENT. END QUOTE.

6. DURING THE DISCUSSION WHICH FOLLOWED, THE UK NADREP STATED THAT, CONSISTENT WITH THE UK POSITION WHICH WOULD PRECLUDE THE TSG FROM ADDRESSING "SINGLE SERVICE" ISSUES, THE UK OPPOSES TRANSFERRING AC/225 (PANEL VIII) TO THE TSG INITIALLY. FURTHER, HE STATED THAT THE UK BELIEVES THAT THE TSG COULD BE FRUITFULLY EMPLOYED IN ITS FIRST YEAR BY EXAMINING THE ISSUES OF NAVIGATION, IDENTIFICATION, AND HF CHANNEL EVALUATION TECHNIQUES.

7. AFTER A NUMBER OF UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPTS TO SEEK A COMPROMISE, THE CHAIRMAN ASKED FOR NATIONAL POSITIONS ON THE CHANGES REQUESTED BY THE UK. DENMARK AND FRANCE AGREED, AND BELGIUM, THE NETHERLANDS, AND THE US DISAGREED. THE GERMAN NADREP DID NOT TAKE A STAND. COMMENT: BASED ON PREVIOUS GERMAN STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE TSG, WE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 00532 02 OF 02 312015Z

DOUBT THAT GERMANY WOULD ACCEDE TO THE UK POSITION. END COMMENT. THE CHAIRMAN ASKED NADREPS TO EXAMINE THE UK STATEMENT AND REPORT THEIR NATIONAL AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING.

8. COMMENT. IT APPEARS THAT CANADA DOES NOT INTEND TO TAKE A STRONG POSITION EITHER FOR OR AGAINST THE TSG. WE HAVE LEARNED THAT WITHIN THEIR MILITARY SERVICE THEY HAVE DIFFERENCES IN TERMS OF THEIR SUPPORT FOR A TSG. IN OUR VIEW, THE CANADIAN POSITION IS ACCEPTABLE SO LONG AS THEY DO NOT DECIDE TO SUPPORT THE UK. WE ARE CONVINCED THAT THE UK IS TRYING TO UNDERMINE FORMATION OF THE TSG AND TO EXCLUDE COMMUNICATIONS (SPECIFICALLY AC/225-PANEL VIII) FROM THE TSG. THE RATIONALE BEHIND THIS POSITION APPEARS TO BE A CONVICTION ON THE PART OF THE BRITISH ARMY THAT THEY NOW EXERT A HEAVY INFLUENCE IN EUROCOM, AND A FEAR THAT FORMATION OF A STRONG TSG ON COMMUNICATIONS IN NATO WOULD LESSEN THEIR

INFLUENCE AND THAT OF EUROCOM WITHIN NATO, END COMMENT.

9. RECOMMEND THAT WE CONTINUE TO MAINTAIN OUR POSITION
BASED ON PREVIOUS GUIDANCE THAT WE APPROVE THE DRAFT
TOR AS WRITTEN IN AC/259-N/219. ACTION REQUESTED:
WASHINGTON CONCURRENCE.STRAUSZ-HUPE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 30-Aug-1999 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 31-Jan-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977NATO00532
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Expiration:
Film Number: n/a
Format: TEL
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t19770191/baaabbnq.tel
Line Count: 280
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Message ID: 5c9584de-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) USNATO 0465 DTG 271642Z JAN 77 (NOTAL) (B) USNATO 0475 DTG 280919Z JAN 77 (NOTAL) (C) USNATO 0143 DTG 121725Z JAN 77
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 29-Sep-2004 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 3681159
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NADREPS MEETING, JANUARY 24, 1977, DISCUSSION OF TRI-SERVICE GROUP ON COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS (TSG)
TAGS: NATO, ETEL, MARR
To: STATE SECDEF MULTIPLE
Type: TE
vdkgvkey: odbcc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/5c9584de-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009

